REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-36 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 11, 12, 15, 17, 27-31, 34, and 36 are amended. No claim is canceled or added. Claims 1-12 and 14-36 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Applicant thanks the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the claim limitation of "outputting a second category of the plurality of categories, the second category being determined and flagged expired" is asserted to lack specification support.

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification on file provides sufficient support for the above-cited claim limitation at, for example, paragraphs [0050], [0058], and [0060]. Paragraph [0050] teaches organizing a search result set into categories of articles. Paragraph [0058] teaches determining whether a category of articles are expired using an expiration date. Paragraph [0060] teaches providing a result set with expired search results that are flagged expired. Accordingly, the specification provides sufficient written description of the invention recited in claim 14 as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In paragraphs 6 through 12 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2003/0220913 to Doganata et al. (Doganata) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7054860 to Inaba et al. (Inaba) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220912 to Fain et al. (Fain); claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba, Fain, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046311 to Baidya et al. (Baidya); claims 29 and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba, Fain, Baidya, and U.S. Patent No. 7082428 to Denny et al. (Denny); claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba, Fain[1], Baidya, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0267813 to Rivers-Moore et al. (Rivers-Moore); and claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba, Fain, Baidya, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0010150 to Shaath et al. (Shaath).   This discussion combines these rejections in order to simplify the issues.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite:

A method comprising:
(a)   receiving a search query;
(b)   determining whether the search query has been previously received;
(c)   responsive to a determination that the search query has not been previously received,
           (i)   receiving a new result set associated with the search query,
           (ii)   storing the new result set associated with the search query in an offline-accessible data store, and
           (iii)   outputting the new result set as a search result of the search query;

---

[1] The Examiner did not cite the Fain reference in rejecting claim 33.   Because claim 33 is dependent on claim 1, and claim 1 is rejected over Doganata, Inaba, and Fain, Applicant assumes the Examiner meant to cite the Fain reference in rejecting claim 33.

(d)　responsive to a determination that the search query has been previously received,

　　　(i)　retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query from the offline-accessible data store, the previously stored result set comprising a plurality of categories each of which comprises one or more articles,

　　　(ii)　determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and

　　　(iii)　responsive to a determination that the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query.

Claim 1 recites a method for outputting a search result for a received search query. The method determines whether the query has been previously received. If the query has not be previously received, a new result set is received, stored associated with the query, and outputted. Otherwise the method determines whether at least one of a plurality of categories of a previously stored result set associated with the query is valid, and if so returns the category as a search result of the query. This technique is useful, for example, in providing offline searches.

The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose "(d) responsive to a determination that the search query has been previously received ... (ii) determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and (iii) responsive to a determination that the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query."

Doganata discloses techniques for automatically selecting information sources that are most relevant to user queries.   See Doganata, Abstract.   The Examiner cited paragraphs [0022] and [0033] for disclosing limitation (c)(i) as previously recited in claim 1.   These paragraphs disclose that a category is associated to a query to determine the context of the category, and that if a query was previously used by a user within a particular context then when the user types in the query again the query will be associated with a category for that particular context.

The Examiner acknowledged that Doganata fails to disclose claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as previously recited in claim 1.   It follows that Doganata does not disclose (1) determining whether a category of a result set of a search query is a valid search result responsive to the search query has been previously received, and (2) outputting the category as a search result of the search query responsive to the category being determined a valid search result set of the search query as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Inaba fails to disclose the claimed elements not taught by Doganata.   Inaba teaches a method to modify a searching profile on the basis of a user's evaluation of a search result.   See Inaba, Abstract.   The searching profile and corresponding search result are stored in a search history table and can be subsequently recovered.   See Inaba, col. 7, lines 12-17 (7:12-17).

The Examiner cited 5:3-5, 6:31-52, 6:63-7:57, and Figures 1 and 16 of Inaba for disclosing limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as previously recited in claim 1.   The cited sections disclose that a user can restore a previous searching profile and, as a result a corresponding previous search result is displayed.   However, the cited sections and drawings, like the rest of Inaba, do not disclose determining whether the previous search result is valid.   Thus,

Inaba does not disclose determining whether a category of a result set of a search query is a valid search result responsive to the search query has been previously received. It follows that Inaba also does not disclose outputting the category as a search result of the search query responsive to the category being determined a valid search result set of the search query.

Fain also fails to disclose the claimed elements not taught by Doganata and Inaba. Fain teaches a system and method to categorize pages in a search result into commercial pages and information pages and present the categorized pages to user. See Fain, paragraphs [0045-46].

The Examiner cited paragraphs [0020], [0046], and [0048] for disclosing a result set of a search query comprising multiple categories of articles and outputting one such category as a search result of the search query as previously recited in claim 1. Paragraph [0020] teaches that a user of the Fain system can organize search results based on their commercial nature and to specify category-based presentation rules. Paragraph [0046] teaches that the criteria the Fain system uses to categorize search results are customizable. Paragraph [0048] teaches that the Fain system categorizes records or search results as either commercial or non-commercial (informational) according to their commercial nature. The cited sections, like the rest of Fain, do not disclose determining whether a query has been previously received (the first determination). Thus, Fain does not disclose determining whether a category of a result set is a valid search result for the query (the second determination) responsive to the first determination. It follows that Fain also does not disclose outputting the category as a search result of the query responsive to the second determination as recited in amended claim 1.

The combination of Doganata, Inaba, and Fain also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features cited above. Even if Doganata, Inaba, and Fain arguably are combined, at best the combination teaches displaying a previously stored categorized result as a search result for a search query. This is not a configuration in which a category of a result set is determined whether it is a valid search result for a search query responsive to the search query has been previously received, and if the category is determined to be a valid search result of the search query then it is outputted as a search result of the search query.

Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath also fail to disclose the claimed elements not taught by Doganata, Inaba, and Fain. Baidya discloses a system that crawls the Internet for web sites, extracts URLs from web sites, categorizes the web sites and URLs, and conducts user search queries that search a subset of the web sites and URLs based on the category information. See Baidya, Abstract Summary, paragraphs [0013], [0019] and [0020]. Denny discloses a system and method for collaborative searching. Denny's system receives search queries in a query server, which stores previously executed queries and corresponding results in a database. Subsequent search queries are compared to the stored queries in the query server. If a stored query is substantially similar to a subsequent query, Denny's system returns to the user the result corresponding to the stored query as the search result of the subsequent query. See Denny, col. 2, lines 3-11. Denny, however, does not discuss validating a category of a result set as claimed. Rivers-Moore discloses a solution for a data file that enables a user to interact with data in the data file. See Rivers-Moore, Summary. The solutions are downloaded and stored locally. When a solution is needed, a unique special name for the solution identifier is computed to determine whether the solution is stored locally. If the solution is stored locally and up-to-date, Rivers-

Moore's system uses the local solution, otherwise it downloads the solution from online. See Rivers-Moore, paragraphs [0079-0105], and Fig. 7. Shaath discloses a method and system for managing a file, including determining an expiration date and a minimum lifespan for the file, and deleting the file when expired. See Shaath, paragraphs [0102-0104], and Fig. 6. None of Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath discloses determining whether at least one of a plurality of categories of a previously stored result set of a search query is valid and if so outputting the category as a search result of the search query, as recited in claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) of amended claim 1.

In view of the above, Doganata, Inaba, Fain, Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1 as amended. Thus, independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over the cited references. Independent claim 17, 34, and 36, and dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, dependent claim 11 is amended to now recite additional limitations regarding how a category of a result set is determined to be a valid search result set for a previously received search query. Specifically, dependent claim 11 recites determining whether an article in a category has been modified or a new article of an article type associated with the category has come into existence after a previously stored result set including the category was stored, and determining that the category is not a valid search result if either is true. Applicant submits that none of the cited references discloses or suggests these additional limitations. Accordingly, dependent claim 11 as amended is

patentable over the cited references. Dependent claim 27 and independent claim 34 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, dependent claim 14 recites the following additional limitations: "outputting a second category of the plurality of categories, the second category being determined and flagged expired." Applicant submits that none of the cited references discloses or suggests these additional limitations.

The Examiner cited paragraph [0048] of Fain, paragraphs [0013], [0020], [0023], [0050-55], [0057-59], and [0065] of Baidya for disclosing the above additional limitation of dependent claim 14. Paragraph [0048] of Fain teaches that the Fain system categorizes records or search results as either commercial or non-commercial (informational) according to their commercial nature. Paragraph [0013] of Baidya discloses that a user of the Baidya system can perform focused search queries for static and dynamic information. Paragraph [0020] discloses a Company Directory Engine that searches for relevant companies in a particular industry or sector. Paragraph [0023] discloses a BioNews Engine that can conduct focused searches for relevant news. Paragraphs [0050-59] disclose a Back-End Processing Engine that periodically gathers information available on the Internet to update a local database. Paragraph [0065] discloses a mechanism to discover new organizations through searches. None of the cited sections discloses or suggests outputting a category of a result set as a search result of a search query *that is determined and flagged expired*. Updating a database with information retrieved from the Internet does not disclose or suggest these limitations because the Baidya system does not teach determining the information

being updated as expired or label them as expired in a search result. Accordingly, dependent claim 14 is patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited reference and requests that the application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

In addition, if the Examiner withdraws some of the rejections and maintains the rest rejections, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter this amendment in order to clarify and simplify the issues for appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mihai Florin Ionescu

Date: July 23, 2009   By: /Jie Zhang/ _____

Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA   94041
Tel.:   (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200